

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1 and 3-14 are pending.

### **I. Specification Amendments:**

The amendment to paragraph [0098] of the specification addresses the Examiner concerns about the manner in which the application identifies various trademarks.

### **II. Rejections Over the Prior Art:**

In responding to the Examiner's prior art rejections, Applicant here only justifies the patentability of independent claim 1. As the Examiner will appreciate, should independent claim 1 be patentable over the prior art, narrower dependent claims would also necessarily be patentable. Accordingly, Applicant does not separately discuss the patentability of the dependent claims, although it reserves the right to do so at a later time if necessary.

Claim 1 has been rejected for obviousness (35 U.S.C. § 103(b)) given the combination of USP 5,000,194 ("Honert") with USP 6,024,702 ("Iversen").

Claim 1 has further been rejected for obviousness (35 U.S.C. § 103) given the combination of USP 6,162,101 ("Fischer") with Honert and Iversen.

Claim 1 have been amended to make clear that *"the electrical contacts are not formed as part of the printed circuit board"* that electrically connects the end of at least one conducting wire to each of the electrical contacts. This limitation is supported by Applicant's disclosure. See, e.g., Fig. 11C showing electrical contacts 240 that are formed separately from the printed circuit board 300.

The Examiner agrees that neither Honert nor Fischer disclose the printed circuit board in any manner, and thus obviously fails to disclose the newly added limitation quoted above.

Moreover, Iverson—the secondary reference used by the Examiner to illustrate the use of a printed circuit board—also does not disclose or suggest electrical contacts that do not comprise a part of the printed circuit board. As the Examiner's own citation to Iverson shows, the relevant electrical contact disclosed in Iverson (22; Fig. 5) are formed as a part of printed circuit 20.

In short, neither Honert, Fischer, nor Iversen disclose or suggest this newly added limitation to the claims. Accordingly, no possible combination of these references discloses this limitation, and hence no combination can render claim 1 (or claims dependent thereon) unpatentable for obviousness. See MPEP § 2143.03.

\* \* \* \* \*

Based on the above remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that pending claims 1 and 3-14 are allowable, and requests that a Notice of Allowance issue for these claims.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Terril Lewis /

---

Terril Lewis, Reg. No. 46,065

Date: January 12, 2007

**CUSTOMER NO. 29855**

Wong, Cabello, Lutsch,  
Rutherford & Bruculeri, L.L.P..  
20333 SH 249, Suite 600  
Houston, TX 77070  
832/446-2405  
Fax 832/446-2424